



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

fall in with the suggestion that "the study of the formation of the canon makes it possible to think that the same influences which resulted in the fixed canon of the Old Testament in ancient times may at a future time lead to some more defined modification in our conception of a sacred canon." The writer seems in some places to vacillate between a more conservative and a more liberal position.

The articles on "Leviticus" and "Numbers" are practically extracts from the fuller material found in the just published Oxford *Analytical Hexateuch*, of which Mr. Battersby and J. E. Carpenter are joint editors. The analysis is minute to the extreme, the writer himself saying: "The extent to which this process is carried out may seem unwarranted, for it has not been usual to press the analysis so far." When one reads the admirable remarks on "the religious value" of the two books—all too compact and short—he longs for the day when there shall be less anatomy and more physiology of the Old Testament. The articles covering the other Old Testament books present the critical positions up to the present. Regarding Micah one may perhaps prefer to stand with Professor Driver rather than go the length of Professor Nowack. The literature at the close of each contribution is well selected and peculiarly valuable. It were to be desired that the space devoted to the several books were more evenly allotted, *e. g.*, Nahum four pages, Micah one only.

*Old Testament Geography*.—Especially valuable in its comprehensive character is the article, by Colonel Conder, on "Palestine," an immense amount of information being packed in its fifteen pages. Colonel Conder says: "The great geographical book of the Old Testament is that of Joshua. The description of the boundaries of the land applies . . . to a time previous to that of the captivity of Gad in B. C. 734, and to that of the Moabite conquest in B. C. 850." "A careful examination of the geography of the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, by the aid of modern exploration, shows . . . that in no case does there appear to be any element suggesting that the descriptions were penned after the captivity." "The geography of the book of Joshua is so exhaustive that little is added to it in the Old Testament books that follow."

GEORGE S. BURROUGHS.

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

*Old Testament History*.—Of the articles which come within the province of Old Testament history the most important is that on "Moses," by Professor Bennett. This begins by giving the narrative

of Moses' life according to the document J, and follows it with the story of E, and this with that of P. The several items which correspond are designated by like notation in the three cases, so that the resemblances and differences are readily seen. The biblical material outside the Pentateuch is then given. The reconstruction of the history gives the following outline as that on which most modern critics agree :

(*a*) That Moses was the leader under whom Israel was delivered from bondage in Egypt and from peril of annihilation by the Red Sea, and was governed during its sojourn in the wilderness ; (*b*) that through him Israel received a revelation which was a new departure in the national religion and the foundation of Judaism and Christianity ; and (*c*)—practically another aspect of the last point—that he originated or formulated many customs and institutions from which the later national system was developed ; that thus (*d*) Israel owed to Moses its existence as a nation ; and (*e*) Moses is a unique personality of supreme importance in Old Testament history. (Pp. 444*b*, 445*a*.)

The leading critics are quoted in support of these positions. The probability that Moses grew up in Egyptian surroundings is admitted, but it is denied that he was greatly influenced in his work as a medium of divine revelation to Israel by his Egyptian training. It is regarded as possible that he may have been the author of narratives or poems, and that portions of such work are preserved in the Pentateuch ; but, if so, we have no means of identifying such fragments. It is also held that the question what new elements of cult and faith Moses added to the religion of Israel can be only very partially answered. The article concludes with a notice of some of the extra-canonical traditions. The whole is a careful presentation of the state of our knowledge as it is today.

In this connection we may notice the article of Professor Macalister on the "Plagues of Egypt." Here also we find the criticism of the Pentateuch recognized, but the recognition is not so complete and its implications are not so thoroughly thought out as in the preceding case. It is shown that the groundwork of the narrative (J) knows seven plagues, that another document (E) gives four or six, and that P relates six. Now it would seem to be correct method to determine whether the oldest document should not be the basis of the discussion. As it is, we find the historicity of all the narratives accepted, as though they were on the same footing ; or, rather, we find that two inconsistent positions show themselves in different parts of the article. Thus the probability is recognized that the *murrain* and the *boils* "are respectively the Jahvistic and priestly records of the one plague." Then

immediately following is an extended discussion of the nature of both plagues, both being treated as actual inflictions. In like manner we find the "sundering of the land of Goshen" dated from the fourth plague, with no consciousness of the fact that this separation of the land of Goshen is characteristic of one of the documents throughout.

Otherwise this article is both interesting and instructive. Its discussion of the nature of the plagues is enriched with numerous citations and parallel cases from the literature, and a bibliography is given at the end. An interesting article on the subject, which appeared in *Die christliche Welt*, November 5, 1896, has escaped the author's attention.

The history of the "Philistines" is given by Professor Beecher, who has made industrious use of the sources of our information. W. Max Müller's discussion of *Die Urheimat der Philister* probably appeared after the article was in print. Professor Beecher's well-known conservatism appears in his endeavor to justify all the statements of the Hebrew historians, with no distinction between the documents. Thus the notoriously late assertion that Samuel defeated the Philistines "so that they came no more into the coasts of Israel" is gravely quoted and asserted not to be inconsistent with other statements of very different tenor made by the older document. The Philistine oppression from which Shamgar was the deliverer is also taken as a matter of history, and no notice is taken of the grave problems thus raised.

With these reservations the article may be read with profit, and it is of course true that the defect in matters of criticism is less serious in a case of this kind than it might be in some others.

Rev. John Taylor discusses the "Patriarchs," by which he means those named in the genealogical tables of Genesis before Abraham. The author comes to the conclusion, which he quotes from Professor Ryle, that the antediluvians constitute a group of demigods or heroes whose names, in the earliest days of Hebrew tradition, filled up the blank between the creation of man and the age of the Israelite patriarchs. The longevity ascribed to these personages is shown to be unhistorical, and a table is given showing the variant readings of the Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Greek texts. A similar table shows the uncertainty of the chronology from Noah to Abraham. The author declines to follow Budde in making the numbers given by the Samaritan to be original. But he does not state which of the recensions is to be preferred.

Other articles which come within the scope of this notice are "Korah" (by Selbie), which assumes the triple analysis of the narrative; "Laban," "Lot," "Machir," "Manasseh" (by Driver), all of which are on the plane that we expect from this accomplished scholar; "Manasseh the King" (by Peake), which treats the story of the repentance as a "characteristic example of the chronicler's method of rewriting history;" "Pharaoh" (by Griffith), whose critical caution is well placed, and which acknowledges that the Egyptian monuments give us no record either of the oppression or of the exodus.

Articles on "Melchizedek," "Merodach-Baladan," "Medes," and "Nebuchadnezzar" are contributed by Professor Sayce. From anyone else it would be astonishing to see Hommel's parallel reproduced, which likens the king of Jerusalem in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets to Melchizedek. Equally surprising is it to see the statement that Jehoiakin was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar, made on the authority of Josephus, in the face of the silence of the Hebrew sources. But some allowance must be made for the personal equation.

"Mesha" (by Price), "Micaiah" (by Patrick), "Midian" (by Chapman), "Mordecai" (by White), "Naaman" (by McClymont), and "Nehemiah" (by Batten) call for no special remark. In general they accomplish the purpose for which a dictionary of the Bible is compiled.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE.

*New Testament History and Theology.*—This volume contains no contribution to New Testament history which compares in value with Dr. Sanday's "Jesus Christ" in the preceding volume. The nearest approach to it here found is Dr. F. H. Chase's "Peter (Simon)," which, using all the data obtainable from the New Testament and patristic writings, is original, concise, and suggestive. The treatment of the story as drawn from the Acts is not so valuable as the discussion of "St. Peter in Christian Tradition." The material for this section is presented in clear form, convenient for independent study. Dr. Chase accepts the tradition of Peter's activity in Rome in conjunction with Paul, holds that Peter did so important a work in Syrian Antioch as to warrant the second-century tradition that he was the founder of that church, thinks there is no evidence that he ever preached in Pontus or Asia Minor, and concludes that he was put to death in Rome by Nero, in connection with the persecution in 64. The author is fertile in conjectures—for instance, he accounts for Peter's visit to